



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/607,822	06/27/2003	Paul Leblans	27500-157	8413	
75	90 09/06/2005		EXAMINER		
Joseph Guy			GAGLIARDI, ALBERT J		
NEXSEN PRUI	ET JACOBS & POLLAR	D, LLC			
P.O. Box 10107	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Greenville, SC	29603		2878		
			DATE MAILED: 09/06/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/607,822	LEBLANS ET AL.	LEBLANS ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Albert J. Gagliardi	2878				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING mailed in may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is specified above, the maximum statutory per reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a replication will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAI	ATION. ly be timely filed IS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23	7 June 2003.					
2a) □		his action is non-final.					
3)	<i>,</i> —						
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	on of Claims						
4) 🖂	4) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)[5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-51</u> is/are rejected.						
7)							
8) 🗌	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 June 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:							
•	1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* 8	See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	ceivea.				
Attachmen							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date				
3) 🛛 Infori	e of Dramsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ r No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/03</u> .		rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Comment on Submissions

1. This action is responsive to submissions of 27 June 2003.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The IDS filed 29 October 2003 does not comply with the rules of the Office regarding submission because it does not include at least the application and the filing date on each page as required. As a courtesy to applicant, the examiner has supplied the missing information and

considered the IDS. See MPEP 502.

3. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure

statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information

submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A (1) states, "the list may not be

incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless

the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been

considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Regarding claims 29-30, the phrase "optionally" in claim 29 renders the claim indefinite

because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed

invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

5. Claims 31-51 provide for the use of a storage phosphor screen or panel, but, since the

claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what

Application/Control Number: 10/607,822 Page 3

Art Unit: 2878

method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 31-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products*, *Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 1, 15-28, 31 and 45-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hell *et al.* (US 2001/0007352 A1 and related to EP 1113458 A1) in view of Homme *et al* (US 2001/0030291 A1 and related to WO 99/66351) and Okada *et al.* (US 2002/0162965 A1 and related to EP 1231483 A2).

Regarding claim 1, *Hell* discloses a binderless storage phosphor panel or screen comprising a vacuum deposited phosphor layer (par.0020) of CsBr:Eu (par.0031) on a support wherein the support includes a layer of, for example glass or aluminum material (par.0043).

Regarding an amorphous carbon support, although not specifically disclosed, those skilled in the art appreciate supports such as amorphous carbon as well known in the art (see for example *Homme* at par. 0041). Therefore, absent some degree of criticality, the use of a carbon support would have been an obvious design choice in view of the known functional equivalence thereof. In addition, *Okada* discloses that amorphous carbon has advantages over aluminum and glass in that it has low absorption (and consequently low backscatter), good medicine resistance, and high heat resistance (par. 0009-0014).

Regarding claims 15-28, *Hell* discloses that the phosphor is a needle shaped (par. 0015) CsBr: Eu phosphor (par. 0031).

Regarding claims 45-51, as best understood, the use of storage phosphor panels and screens are well known for use in a variety of medical imaging applications including mammography.

10. Claims 2-14, 29-30 and 32-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hell*, *Homme*, and *Okada* as applied above, and further in view of Willems *et al.* (US 5,736,069).

Regarding claim 2-10, *Willems* discloses that substrates for storage phosphor panels may include a variety of auxiliary and additional layers including polymeric layers and reflective aluminum layers and wherein the additional layers may be formed as interlayers and/or backing layers on the substrate (col. 5, line 52 to col. 6, line 9). Willems teaches that such layers may be

used for a variety of purposes including improving bonding, sensitivity, sharpness etc. (col. 5, lines 52-58). Those skilled in the art also appreciate that the provision of additional layers for strength, protection, scratch resistance, anti-static and anti-friction purposes are also well known. Therefore the use of additional layers including a polymeric layer, a reflective aluminum layer and/or a protective layer would have been an obvious design choice in order to improve operation of the storage phosphor panel. Absent some degree of criticality, the particular thickness of any of the layers would be a matter of routine design choice within the skill of a person of ordinary skill in the art depending on the needs of the particular application.

Regarding claims 11-14, Okada further discloses the use of protective layers comprising parylene (par.0079). Absent some degree of criticality, the use of parylene C, D or HT is view as a matter of routine design choice.

Regarding claim 29, the method as recited according to claim 29 is suggested by the apparatus as suggested by Hell, Homme, and Okada as applied above, and are rejected accordingly.

Regarding claim 30, Willems further suggests the use of a specularly reflective aluminum layer (col. 6, line 1-2). Absent some degree of criticality, the order at which the aluminum layer is deposited is viewed as a matter of routine design choice depending on the needs of the application.

Regarding claims 32-44, as best understood, the use of storage phosphor panels and screens are well known for use in a variety of medical imaging applications including mammography.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2878

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Albert J. Gagliardi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2436.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 9 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David P. Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent 13.

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Albert J. Gagliardi Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2878